

Serial No. 09/904,794

Specifically, although conduits 48 and 50 are shown in Crowder as angled, there is no disclosure that opposed inlet apertures 44 and 46 (or apertures 28 or openings 168) in the thickness of the wall are angled. In particular and as suggested by Examiner Weinstein in the telephone interview on February 8, 2005, the first duct was recited in claim 21 as extending at an acute angle in the annular wall of the supply tube (and also terminating at the inner and outer surfaces of the annular wall). Likewise, there is no disclosure that the duct in the thickness in the wall forming second conduit 32 and through which ingredient 52 is fed is angled. Further, the outer surface of conduits 48 and 50 or the outer surface of the inlet into second conduit 32 does not contact the flowable food product. It is respectfully submitted that apertures 28 or 168 of Crowder correspond to the recited ducts, but do not extend at an acute angle or introduce the ingredient 51 into ingredient 52 in a manner as recited in claim 21.

Please note that although Mannara shows inner tube having ducts 33, the flow of material is from outside of the inner tube to inside of the inner tube or in other words opposite to the direction recited in claim 21. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Crowder and Mannara show alternate approaches, and it is respectfully submitted that there is nothing to suggest that they would be utilized together, and the Examiner is selecting a single feature of Mannara and ignoring all of the remaining teachings thereof and applying such selected feature in a manner which is not suggested by Crowder or Mannara.

The opening in dividers 52, 53 and 54 next to blades 72, 73 and 74 of Kinney are not disclosed as extending at an acute angle. Further, where is swirling disclosed in Kinney and more importantly why does swirling evidence reverse movement? However, even assuming that swirling results in reverse movement (which the applicants contest), Kinney does not show flowing through a duct at an acute angle in a manner as recited in claim 21.

It is agreed that Crowder discloses supplying a food product with a food ingredient from a supply tube within a fill tube (which the Examiner also recognizes is deficient from the recited invention). How does the fact that Friedman, Gundlach and/or French also include this feature in any way supply the admitted deficiencies of Crowder as the undersigned is unable to find any basis or reasons for doing so?

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 21 and the claims which depend therefrom has been overcome. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/904,794

Likewise, Crowder does not show the second duct as recited in claims 33, 34, 41 and 42 or the arrangements defined in the other dependent claims. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance for these separate and independent reasons.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of the claims based upon Crowder has been overcome for the same reasons that the rejection of the claims without Crowder had been overcome. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

If the present amendment does not place the above application in condition for allowance, a further interview with Examiner Weinstein by telephone or in person is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Germick, et al.

Dated: May 8, 2006.

By: 

Alan D. Kamrath (Reg. No. 28,227)
NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 820
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Tel: (612) 392-7306
Fax: (612) 349-6556